IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

EDWARD KAUFFMAN, Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:04-CV-543
JUDGE EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.
Magistrate Judge Terence P. Kemp

THE SEDALIA MEDICAL
CENTER, INC., PROFIT
SHARING PLAN AND TRUST, et al.,
Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court for consideration of the Defendants' Motion for Stay of Proceedings to Enforce Judgment and for Posting of a Cash Supersedeas Bond with the Clerk of Court. (Doc. #69). For the reasons that follow, the motion is granted.

I.

On March 27, 2006, this Court granted Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Administrative Record as to his claim for pension benefits under a plan governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ["ERISA"], 29 U.S.C. § 1001, et seq. The Court entered Final Judgment on February 9, 2007, after awarding Plaintiff attorneys' fees, costs and prejudgment interest¹. A Notice of Appeal was filed on March 8, 2007. On April 26, 2007, Defendants filed the instant Motion to Stay enforcement of the Judgment and for posting of a supersedeas bond.

In support of their motion, Defendants represent that the judgment proceeds are available

¹The calculated amount of the award is \$202,682.26. This amount does not reflect any post-judgment interest.

in cash to post a bond or as collateral for a supersedeas bond. The proceeds are, however, part of a retirement plan and, according to Defendants, the plan documents are silent on the issue of plan fiduciaries collateralizing plan assets. Thus, the Defendants seek court approval to post and deposit \$210,000 with the Clerk of Court pending outcome of the appeal. Alternatively, Defendants request an order that Defendants hold the amount of \$210,000 as a supersedeas bond, invested in certificates of deposit, to be released upon court order.

The Plaintiff does not oppose Defendants posting a cash supersedeas bond with the Clerk but requests an amount of \$270,000. Plaintiff originally requested \$220,000, to adequately cover post-judgment interest. In an Amended Memorandum, Plaintiff requested \$270,000 to cover attorneys' fees on appeal. Defendants oppose the request.

The Court concludes that a bond in the amount of \$220,000 is sufficient. The Court finds that the inclusion of attorneys' fees incurred in connection with the appeal is not appropriate.

II.

The Defendants' Motion (Doc. #69) is GRANTED. The Defendants shall forthwith post a bond with the Clerk of this Court in the amount of \$220,000.00.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

10-4-2007

DATE

EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE